

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-18 and 21-42 were pending. Claims 1-7, 10-30, and 34-42 are canceled. New claims 43-76 are added. Claims 8 and 9 are amended to depend from claim 43. Claims 31 and 32 are amended to depend from claim 76. Claims 8-9, 31-33, and 43-76 are now pending in this application.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 10-18, 21-29, 30-33, 37, 39, and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, claims 1-38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of Mattox et al., Streeter and Lochbaum, and Lauffer, claims 39-42 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over a combination of Mattox et al., Streeter and Lochbaum, Lauffer, and Consumers Checkbook, and claims 1 and 40 were objected to due to informalities.

During the telephone conferences, the Examiner clarified potentially allowable claim scope. Applicant has amended the claims accordingly. Specifically, new claims 43 -76 are added, and no new matter has been introduced. Claims 1-7, 10-30, and 34-42 are canceled. Claims 8, 9, 31, and 32 are amended for clarify and to correct claim dependency.

Applicant respectfully submit that newly added independent claims 43 and 76 are patentable over Mattox et al., Streeter and Lochbaum, Lauffer, and Consumers Checkbook, alone or in combination. Claims 43 and 76 distinguished from the above cited references, alone or in combination, at least by reciting a method and system, respectively, that find and rank the technical capability of a geographic region using automatic scoring of expertise indicated in papers published by authors affiliated with institutions located in a geographic region, and allowing the user to hierarchically drill-down (navigate) the geographic regions and institutions to find the authors (experts), eventually linking to information on expertise and the papers on which the ranking are based.

Specifically, claim 43 of the instant application recites an automated method for identifying and displaying entities having expertise in one or more subjects. The method includes querying a database for documents relevant to a subject, the documents being indicative

of expertise in one or more subject areas and calculating a first score for each relevant document based on one or more indicators of expertise in the subject. The method also includes determining entities associated with each relevant document. Each of the entities is associated with one or more documents in a set of documents, and the entities include at least one institution, at least one author, and at least one geographic region. In an embodiment, the determining of the at least one institution associated with a relevant document includes determining from a document in the set of documents an affiliated institution of the at least one author. Further, determining a geographic region associated with a relevant document includes determining an address of an entity, which is determined at least in part on a document in the set of documents associated with the entity.

The method further includes calculating a second score for each entity based on the first scores of the one or more documents in the set of documents associated with each entity, and calculating a third score for each of a plurality of geographic regions based on the second scores of each entity located within each geographic region. The method also includes ranking expertise associated with the plurality of entities based on the second scores for each entity and ranking expertise associated with the plurality of geographic regions based on the third scores for each geographic region. Additionally, the method includes hierarchically displaying to a user the ranking of expertise of the plurality of geographic regions. The hierarchical displaying includes displaying a user-selectable reference to one or more entities associated with each geographic region. The user-selectable reference to one or more entities further displays a hierarchical ranking of expertise of the one or more entities associated with the selected geographic region. The displaying the ranking of expertise includes at least one of graphically or numerically depicting levels of expertise.

Applicant submits that Mattox et al., Strecker and Lochbaum, Lauffer, and Consumers Checkbook, alone or in combination, failed to teach or suggest all the claim elements as recited in claim 43 of the instant application. Accordingly, claim 43 is patentable over the above cited references.

Claims 8-9 and 44-75 depend, directly or independently, from claim 43. Accordingly, claims 8-9 and 44-75 are patentable over the above cited prior art for at least the same reasons.

Claim 76 of the instant application recites a system for assessing expertise associated with an entity in a subject. The system includes a server system coupled with a database of documents. The server system has a memory which includes a plurality of computer codes. A first code is configured to receive a subject from a user. A second code is configured to query the database for documents relevant to the subject, the documents being indicative of expertise in one or more subject areas. A third code is configured to calculate a first score for each relevant document based on one or more indicators of expertise in the subject. A fourth code is configured to determine entities associated with each relevant document. Each of the entities is associated with one or more documents in a set of documents, and the entities include at least one institution, at least one author, and at least one geographic region. In the system the determining of the at least one institution associated with a relevant document includes determining from a document in the set of documents an affiliated institution of the at least one author. Additionally, determining a geographic region associated with a relevant document includes determining an address of an entity, and the address is determined at least in part on a document in the set of documents associated with the entity.

The system also includes a fifth code configured to calculate a second score for each entity based on the first scores of the one or more documents in the set of documents associated with each entity. A sixth code is configured to calculate a third score for each of a plurality of geographic regions based on the second scores of each entity located within each geographic region. A seventh code is configured to rank expertise associated with the plurality of entities based on the second scores for each entity. An eighth code is configured to rank expertise associated with the plurality of geographic regions based on the third scores for each geographic region. A ninth code is configured to hierarchically display to a user the ranking of expertise of the plurality of geographic regions. In the system, the hierarchically displaying includes displaying a user-selectable reference to one or more entities associated with each

geographic region. The user-selectable reference to one or more entities further displays a hierarchical ranking of expertise of the one or more entities associated with the selected geographic region. Additionally, the displaying the ranking of expertise includes at least one of graphically or numerically depicting levels of expertise.

Applicant submits that Mattox et al., Streeter and Lochbaum, Lauffer, and Consumers Checkbook, alone or in combination, failed to teach or suggest all the claim elements as recited in claim 76 of the instant application. Accordingly, claim 76 is patentable over the above cited references.

Claims 31-33 depend, directly or independently, from claim 76. Accordingly, claims 31-33 are patentable over the above cited prior art for at least the same reasons.

Applicant believes all claims now pending are allowable over the prior art of record.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance and an action to that end is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 650-326-2400.

Respectfully submitted,

/Dah-Bin Kao/

Dah-Bin Kao
Reg. No. 53,092

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 650-326-2400
Fax: 415-576-0300
RTO:dbk:jbs